

~~SECRET~~  
Security Information

4-3343  
Pers. - 4

13 July 1953

MEMORANDUM FOR: Inspector General

THROUGH: Acting Deputy Director (Administration)

SUBJECT: [REDACTED]

25X1A9a

1. Pursuant to your request, this Office has reviewed subject case. Unfortunately, we could only make our review on the basis of the personnel file which apparently has already been reviewed by your Office.

2. The recruiting officer mentioned, [REDACTED] 5X1A9a was never a member of the Personnel Office, but was, and is, an Office of Communications employee who was given authority by that Office to make commitments, on the spot, to likely applicants for Project [REDACTED] 25X1A2d1 Owing to the very sensitive nature of the work experience being possessed by the [REDACTED] applicants, this recruiting arrangement had the concurrence of the Personnel Office. 25X1A2d1 As you know, [REDACTED] is now out of the country and we have determined that the Office of Communications has no record of interviews or other papers which would shed any light on subject's claim that [REDACTED] 25X1A9a told him that the fact he had been caught stealing a radio chassis was of no importance. This Office is inclined to doubt such a claim. The deceptive statement which subject inserted in his PHS "Request of Co. Breaking Co. rule" certainly does not indicate a theft, nor does the further explanatory statement "transferring stock from one Department to another". 25X1A9a

3. This Office has no knowledge of the incident which was uncovered in a Building 13 interview relating to the sleeping bag.

4. Subject was entered on duty under provisional clearance after the Security Office had conducted its usual procedures for such a clearance. The Personnel Office had no way of knowing the nature of the one act revealed in the PHS, and it was not until the Building 13 interviews that the other incident was made known to the Agency. It would appear, therefore, that a provisional entry on duty was in order, unless the Security Office had run down the first point prior to issuing the provisional clearance. This would not be a normal requirement on a provisional, because it generally involves only a central Agency name check.

~~SECRET~~

9

Document No.	
By Change	<input type="checkbox"/>
By [unclear]	<input type="checkbox"/>
Class. Change	78 3 ⑥
NOV 1977	

026

~~SECRET~~  
Security Information  
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- 2 -

5. We note subject's training record and the evaluation of his abilities. It is unfortunate that the two instances existed in his background which, in the opinion of the Security Office, made him ineligible for career employment. This type case is now the exception, rather than the rule, I am glad to say, and I feel that future instances will not occur insofar as promises or statements are concerned involving a field recruiter. Since the rather hectic situation which existed in 1951, the Personnel Office has limited largely field procurement to members of the Personnel Office who have been trained specifically in the procedures to be followed. I have personally resisted efforts to send untrained interviewers from the various Offices into the field, since my past experiences with such individuals leads me to believe they do us infinitely more harm than good.

6. With reference to subsequent developments in this case, wherein the Personnel Office has been in communication with subject concerning the possibility of his being employed, I regret to inform you that an inexcusable error was made in checking our Applicant index. In accordance with standard operating procedure, as outlined in the attached Personnel Procurement Division Memorandum No. 28-52, upon receiving several responses to a blind advertisement for communications-type personnel, the recruitment officer, [REDACTED] called for a check of the Applicant Index. There is attached subject's reply to the ad. Notice he made no reference to previous CIA employment. (Even in the face of a possible freeze, [REDACTED] has personally requested continuation of active recruitment for HQ applicants.) [REDACTED] received word that there was no record of subject, even though a card was on file and had been since July, 1952. The clerk checking the records missed the card, for reasons we are unable to explain. [REDACTED] having received his advice, proceeded with the next step in the recruitment process by identifying the Agency through a letter, over the signature of the Chief, Personnel Procurement Division, and exhibiting interest in subject's qualifications, which is the letter dated 8 July 1953 reported to your Office by subject on 9 July 1953. I regret exceedingly the commission of the error, but it must be attributed to human failure, rather than to lack of an established system. You may be sure that the incident will receive the attention it deserves.

2 Attachments:

- 1 - Letter fr subject
- 2 - PPD Memo 28-52

George E. Maloon  
Personnel Director

~~SECRET~~  
Security Information

# MISSING PAGE

ORIGINAL DOCUMENT MISSING PAGE(S):

Enclosures